



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/519,242	03/06/2000	Carl Herman Haken	CH2000A	8274

7590 04/21/2004
Carl Haken
5 Old Neversink Road
Danbury, CT 06811

EXAMINER

TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2004

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/519,242

Applicant(s)

HAKEN, CARL HERMAN

Examiner

Mylinh T Tran

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment filed 10/01/03.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's Amendment filed 10/01/03 has been entered and carefully considered. The Advisory Action which is sent on 10/28/03 is withdrawn. However, limitations of amended claims have not been found to be patentable over prior art of record. Claims 1-14 are rejected below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al. [US. 6,219,027] in view of Ahern et al. [US. 6,388,658].

As to claims 1, 13 and 14, Shimizu et al. discloses a first processor which functions to generate a first image of a first graphical desktop user interface and a first display screen disposed at a first screen location and connected to the first processor to display the first image (see abstract, figure 9 (D1) and column 5, lines 19-43); a first pointing device connected to the first processor to control movement of a first cursor in the first image (column 6, lines 52-

62); second visual display means and which are displeased at a second display location which is movable in relation to the first display screen location of the first display screen (figure 9, (D1, D2), column 5, line 62 through column 6, line 8); means which determine a first relative direction, from the first display screen to the second visual display means (column 7, lines 9-52 and column 8, lines 20-40) and program means which expand the display of graphical desktop user interface onto the second visual display means at times and the second visual display means are also in the vicinity the first display screen so that movement of the first pointing device in the first relative direction causes the first cursor to move to and to disappear at an edge of first display screen)and further causes the appearance of a new visual indication on the second visual display means (column 2, line 56 through column 3, line 15 and column 9, lines 10-50). The applicant's attention is directed to figure 7, a cursor is moved from point (a) of a first display (D 41) to point (A) of a second display (D 42). Shimizu et al. also cites "when the cursor of the mouse 23 is moved from the display device D41 to the display device D42 or vice versa, the cursor changes its position differently depending on the position of the cursor on a source screen" (column 3, lines 39-45); and "The pointing device 2 is used to move a cursor 3 between the plurality of display devices (1-1)-(1-n)" (column 5, lines 21-25); and "Since the ratio between the pixel pitch on the display device D1 and the pixel pitch on the display device D2 is 2:1, the cursor display position moves

regularly across the display devices D1 and D2" (column 8, lines 23-26). The differences between Shimizu et al. and the claim is a second processor with the second display to move in relation to the first display screen and means for communicating signals between the first processor and the second processor means. Ahern et al. shows multiple computers with plural displays means (see abstract and column 5, lines 50-63 and column 7, lines 52-60) and means for communicating signals at figure 1A, column 5, lines 50-63 and column 7, lines 52-60. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Shimizu et al. and Ahern et al. before them at the time the invention was made to modify the concept of movement the pointing device between two different displays shape taught by Shimizu et al. to include the multiple processors with displays of Ahern et al., in order to provide users an image display system in which a user can control information display on multiple display devices with a single pointing device as taught by Ahern et al.

As to claim 2, while Ahern et al. shows multiple computer processors with plurality of display, Shimizu et al. teaches movement of the first pointing device in the first relative direction causes the first cursor to move to and disappear off an edge of the first display screen in a direction toward the second visual display means and to apparently seamlessly appear as a new cursor on the second display screen (column 7, lines 9-59 and column 8, lines 3-53).

As to claim 3, Shimizu et al. also shows the new cursor appears at an edge of the second display screen that is oriented toward the first display screen (column 19-43).

As to claim 4, Shimizu et al. teaches the first pointing device further functions to control movement of the new cursor on the second display screen (column 6, line 53 through column 7, line 17).

As to claim 5, Shimizu et al. also teaches the first cursor to reappear on the first display screen whenever the new cursor is moved off the edge of the second display screen in a direction toward the first display screen (column 8, lines 33-53).

As to claim 6, Shimizu et al. demonstrates the first pointing device controls the appearance and apparent movement of the new visual indication on the second visual display means (column 10, lines 40-53).

As to claims 7 and 8, Although Shimizu et al. does not explicitly mention communicating being a docking cradle attached at an edge of the first display screen for supporting the second processor means and the means which determine comprise means which sense that the second processor means being in the cradle, it is notoriously well known in the state of the art because the docking cradle is just a container which holds a device such as a palm system. The examiner takes **OFFICIAL NOTICE** of this teaching. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of

Shimizu et al. before him, to modify the container of the palm system to be the docking cradle, as made known in the state of the art.

As to claims 9 and 10, Although Shimizu et al. does not explicitly mention the means for communicating being a wireless interface, for determining comprising a directional antenna array, the means which communicating being an infrared light interface and the means which determine being directional infrared sensors, it is notoriously well known in the state of the art because nowadays there are plural of devices or systems communicating each other without a wire and being an infrared light. The examiner takes **OFFICIAL NOTICE** of this teaching. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Shimizu et al. before him, to modify plural systems communicating each other wirelessly to be a wireless interface system and determining comprising a directional antenna array, as made known in the state of the art.

As to claim 11, Shimizu et al. shows the second visual display means comprising one or more indicator lights. The indicator light could be the on/off button of the second display (figure 9).

As to claim 12, Ahern et al. teaches the second processor means is a device selected from the group consisting of: personal data assistants, laptop computers, digital cameras, audio players, video games, cordless telephones, cellular telephones, television receivers, VCR's and scanners (video, column 2, lines 53-65 and column 4, lines 20-35).

Response to Arguments

Regarding claims 1, 13 and 14, Applicant has argued Shimizu does not describe “suggests means for determining the relative physical direction between his two display screens or for using information regarding the relative direction to control appearance and disappearance of the cursor and/or visual indications”. However, the Examiner does not agree.

Applicant's attention is directed to column 8, lines 20-40, “since the ratio between the pixel pitch on the display device D1 and the pixel pitch on the display device D2 is 2:1, the cursor display position moves regularly across the display devices D1 and D2” and “there are other approaches for determining and converting the cursor movement. For example, when the mouse cursor is displayed on the display device D1, outputs from the mouse could be processed in steps of 2, and when the mouse cursor is displayed on the display device D2, outputs from the mouse could process in steps of 1”. Because the ratio between the pixel pitch of first display and second display is different, the system of Shimizu et al. describes determining the direction for moving from the first to the second display. The applicant's attention is directed to figure 7, a cursor is moved from point (a) of a first display (D 41) to point (A) of a second display (D 42). Shimizu et al. also cites “when the cursor of the mouse 23 is moved from the display device D41 to the display device D42 or vice versa, the cursor changes its position differently depending on the position of the cursor on a source screen” (column 3, lines

Art Unit: 2174

39-45); and "The pointing device 2 is used to move a cursor 3 between the plurality of display devices (1-1)-(1-n)" (column 5, lines 21-25); and "Since the ratio between the pixel pitch on the display device D1 and the pixel pitch on the display device D2 is 2:1, the cursor display position moves regularly across the display devices D1 and D2" (column 8, lines 23-26).

Conclusion

Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires fax a response, (703) 746-7238, may be used for formal After Final communications, (703) 746-7239 for Official communications, or (703) 746-4395 for Non-Official or draft communications. NOTE, A Request for Continuation (Rule 60 or 62) cannot be faxed.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for information facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-1304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8.00AM to 6.30 PM

Art Unit: 2174

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner 's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640,

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2174

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100